



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/889,113

07/11/2001

Katsuhiko Mochizuki

1232-01

7939

35811 7590 07/09/2010
IP GROUP OF DLA PIPER LLP (US)
ONE LIBERTY PLACE
1650 MARKET ST, SUITE 4900
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103

EXAMINER

BUTLER, PATRICK NEAL

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1791

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/09/2010

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

pto.phil@dlapiper.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/889,113	Applicant(s) MOCHIZUKI ET AL.	
	Examiner Patrick Butler	Art Unit 1791	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 May 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 15-19,21,22 and 24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 15-19,21,22 and 24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 15-19, 21, 22, 24, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujimoto (EP 1033422A1) in view of Rowan et al. (US Patent No. 4,851,172), Toshio et al. (Japanese Patent Publication No. JP 52066769 A), and Palmer (US Patent No. 4,529,655), solely, or further in view of Negishi et al. (US Patent No. 4,069,565).

With respect to Claim 15, Fujimoto teaches a method of producing a poly (trimethylene terephthalate) fiber where the yarn is drawn, heat treated and then subjected to a relaxation treatment (a polymer substantially comprising polytrimethylene terephthalate) [0035]. The intrinsic viscosity of the polymer is 0.4 – 1.5, preferably 0.7 – 1.2 (intrinsic viscosity at least 0.7) [0016]. In the process, the multifilaments are extruded from a spinning machine (method of producing multifilament yarn; melt spinning) [0035] and wound round a first roll heated at 30 – 80 °C and then a second heated roll at 100 to 160 °C (hauling off the multi-filament yarn via a first heated roll; second heated roll; subjecting the multi-filament yarn to a heat-treatment at the second roll; subjecting the multi-filament yarn to a relaxation heat treatment; the second heated roll at 105-180 °C) [0038]. The multifilaments are wound around a first roll at a speed

Art Unit: 1791

of 300-3,500 m/min (at a spinning rate of at least 2,000 m/min.) ([0036] and [0037]), drawn by a second roll at a ratio of 1.3 to 4 (subjecting the multi-filament yarn to drawing without winding up between the first heated roll and a second roll at low draw rate) [0038], wound round the second roll (by plural laps of the yarn) [0036], relaxed at a ratio of 0.8-0.999, with the ratio being the winding speed/peripheral speed of the second roll (at a relaxation factor of 10-20%) [0040], mixed by methods such as interlacing before incorporating the yarn into fabric (subjecting the multi-filament yarn to an interlacing treatment) [0045], and wound up on a winder (and winding the multi-filament yarn up as a package) [0036].

“[B]y employing the heat of a second heated roller... a relaxation heat treatment is carried out” (see Applicant’s Specification, page 13, lines 12-30). Thus, Applicant’s Specification clarifies that a heat treatment at a second roll is inherently sufficient to provide a relaxation heat treatment between the second heated roll and a third roll or between the second heated roll and a winder. Such inherency is supported by the heat of the roller transferring to the wrapped yarn which then leaves the roller and continuing its heat treatment until it cools.

Fujimoto fails to teach that the second heated roll used for the relaxation treatment has a surface roughness of 1.5 S – 8 S as required by claim 15.

Rowan is directed to a process for high speed, multi-end polyester yarn (Title). Rowan teaches manufacturing a multi-filament yarn by extruding, passing the filaments through drawing rolls, then through relaxing rolls, and then finally through a conventional air interlacing jet and then wound up (columns 2 and 3). The surface finish

Art Unit: 1791

(R_a) value for the rolls other than the first encountered roll can be between 35 and 120 microinches (0.89 – 3.0 micrometers) (column 4, lines 10 – 20). On page 14 of Applicant's Specification, Applicant indicates that 1.5 S – 8 S is equivalent to 0.8 – 6.3 micrometers as required by claims 15. Rowan suggests that the use of matte rollers produce a yarn with excellent mechanical qualities (column 4, lines 25 – 40).

Rowan does not appear to explicitly teach that R_{max} of the R_a is within the claimed range (e.g., 1.5 S – 8 S).

However, in this regard, Rowan teaches this value for R_a as previously described as well as making the surface smooth, which would minimize the variation in the surface (see col. 5, line 4). As such, Rowan recognizes that the respective R_{max} is a result-effective variable. Since R_{max} is a result-effective variable, one of ordinary skill in the art would have obviously been motivated to determine the optimum R_{max} applied in the process of Rowan through routine experimentation based upon minimizing the variation in R_a to achieve a smooth surface (see col. 5, line 4).

Since Fujimoto lacks disclosure to specific details about the surface roughness of the second heated roller, it would have been necessary and thus obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art practicing the invention of Fujimoto to look to the prior art as exemplified by Rowan to provide the details of the relaxation roller's surface texture. As heated matte rollers having a temperature of at least 140 °C and a surface finish value of 0.89 – 3.0 micrometers which has a relaxation between 1 – 10 percent produces a yarn with excellent mechanical qualities (see Rowan, col. 4, lines 33-35), it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use

Art Unit: 1791

the heated matte finish relaxation rollers of Rowan in the invention of Fujimoto, motivated by the expectation of successfully practicing the invention of Fujimoto and in order to produce a yarn with excellent mechanical qualities (see Rowan, column 4, lines 25 – 40).

The claimed step of preventing the multi-filament yarn from winding back onto the second heated roll during the relaxation heat treatment is stated by the claim to result from reducing the frictional coefficient via a claimed surface roughness and temperature. Fujimoto teaches the claimed second heated roller temperature as described above, and Rowan, as combined, teaches the claimed surface roughness. Thus, Fujimoto in view of Rowan teach the claims steps for preventing the multi-filament yarn from winding back onto the second heated roll.

Fujimoto fails to expressly teach intermingling to a specific CF value.

Toshio teaches interlacing to a CF value of 10-100 with a synthetic multifilament fiber (Abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Toshio's CF value with Fujimoto's process of making filaments and intermingling in order to manufacture a sizeless, twistless fabric (see Toshio) and to give a fabric thus obtained excellent softness, stretchability properties, and color developing properties (see Fujimoto [0044]).

Fujimoto in view of Rowan and Toshio teach that the breaking extension of the yarn is 40% or more, the strength from a stress-strain curve of at least 3 cN/dtex, a Young's modulus of no more than 25 cN/dtex, a minimum value of a differential Young's

Art Unit: 1791

modulus at 3-10% elongation of no more than 6.6 CN/dtex, and an elastic recovery following 10% elongation of at least 90% principally because they teach the same claimed process.

Fujimoto teaches that winding PTT yarn is improved by cooling the yarn before winding to 0-50 °C by blowing a cold wind and that such a cooling process helps to prevent tight winding (controls tension gradient) [0041]. As described above, Fujimoto teaches that the yarn is mixed by methods such as interlacing before incorporating the yarn into fabric (subjecting the multi-filament yarn to an interlacing treatment) [0045], and Rowan, as combined, teaches passing the filaments through drawing rolls and then finally through a conventional air interlacing jet and then wound up (subjecting the multifilament yarn to an interlacing treatment with an interlacing treatment nozzle that controls tension gradient) (see cols. 2 and 3). Thus, Fujimoto in view of Rowan and Toshio teach cooling before winding, controlling tension before winding, and interlacing between drawing and winding. However, Fujimoto in view of Rowan and Toshio do not appear to expressly teach an interlacing treatment nozzle controls tension gradient.

Palmer teaches that it is well known to operate interlacing jets with air at room temperature (see col. 1, lines 42-50).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to operate the interlacing jets with air at room temperature as taught by Palmer in the interlacing step of Fujimoto in view of Rowan and Toshio because interlacing with air at room temperature is well known (see Palmer, col. 1, ll. 42-50), interlacing air temperature effects the yarn temperature (see Palmer, col. 2,

Art Unit: 1791

lines 57-64), and cooling PTT before winding beneficially avoids tight winding (controls tension gradient) (see Fujimoto, [0041]).

With respect to the claim limitation of “nozzle,” the interlacing jets taught by Fujimoto, Rowan, and Palmer necessarily include a nozzle because of the acceleration mechanics of a jet.

However, if it is held that a jet does not necessarily include a nozzle for acceleration, Negishi teaches using a fluid jet nozzle within an air jet interlacing apparatus (see col. 8, lines 14-21 and abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use fluid jet nozzle as taught by Negishi in the interlacing apparatus of Fujimoto in order to provide interlaced yarn that contains a desired degree of interlacing for subsequent processing, is free of undesired lengths without interlacing, and requires minimal air jetting for the desired degree of compactness (see Negishi, col. 1, line 63 through col. 2, line 12).

With respect to Claim 16, Fujimoto teaches that the intrinsic viscosity of the polymer is 0.4 – 1.5, preferably 0.7 – 1.2 (intrinsic viscosity at least 0.8) [0016].

As to claim 17, Fujimoto teaches that multifilaments are extruded from a spinning machine at a temperature from 250 – 290 °C [0033], which is 22 – 62°C higher than the melt temperature.

As to claims 18, Fujimoto teaches that the fibers are drawn on the first roll heated at 30 – 80 °C having a peripheral speed of 300 to 3,500 m/min without winding thereon (>3,000 m/min.) [0035].

As to claim 19, Fujimoto teaches in Example 13 that the relaxation ratio is 0.88 (see Table 1 continued, Example 13), which is equivalent to a relaxation factor of 12%.

With respect to Claim 21, Rowan teaches that the surface finish value for the rolls can be between 35 and 120 microinches (0.89 – 3.0 micrometers) (column 4, lines 10 – 20). On page 14 of Applicant's Specification, Applicant indicates that 1.5S – 8S is equivalent to 0.8 – 6.3 micrometers as required by claims 21 (3.2 S – 6.3 S).

With respect to Claim 22, the draw temperature is -15 – 35 °C higher (10-50 °C higher) than the glass transition temperature of poly (trimethylene terephthalate), which is 45 °C.

As to claim 23, Fujimoto teaches that the fibers have the relaxation heat treatment performed on the second and third rolls at temperatures 100 – 160 °C and 120 – 150 °C respectively (page 8, lines 25 – 55).

As to claim 24, Fujimoto teaches that the draw ratio can be 2.20 in Example 13. The Examiner considers a draw ratio of 2.20 to be a "low" draw rate as required by Applicant. Fujimoto in view of Rowan and Toshio teach having strength from a stress/strain curve of at least 3cN/dtex and a breaking extension of at least 42% principally because they teach the same claimed process.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 13 April 2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues with respect to the 35 USC 103(a) rejections. Applicant's arguments appear to be on the grounds that:

1) The amendment of an interlacing treatment nozzle controlling tension gradient is not taught by the references as applied such as Fujimoto and Rowan.

2) Fujimoto's interlacing treatment is not conducted to be a yarn cooling device or a tension gradient controller.

3) Fujimoto does not teach a specific CF value.

4) Fujimoto does not teach the use of a heated roll surface roughness of 1.5-8 S.

5) Fujimoto does not teach a relaxation factor of 10-20%.

6) Fujimoto does not teach a spinning rate of at least 2,000 m/min.

7) Applicant's yarns are employed in clothing. Thus, Rowan's yarns would have different properties.

8) Rowan draws twice, and Applicant only needs to employ drawing once.

9) Toshio's teaching of an interlacing treatment to produce a yarn having a CF value of 10-100 fails to teach PTT multifilament. Thus, it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to vary conditions according to Toshio in a PTT yarn process.

The Applicant's arguments are addressed as follows:

1 and 2) Applicant's arguments with respect to the newly claimed have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

1 and 2) Specifically, as recited above:

Fujimoto teaches that winding PTT yarn is improved by cooling the yarn before winding to 0-50 °C by blowing a cold wind and that such a cooling process helps to prevent tight winding (controls tension gradient) [0041]. As described

Art Unit: 1791

above, Fujimoto teaches that the yarn is mixed by methods such as interlacing before incorporating the yarn into fabric (subjecting the multi-filament yarn to an interlacing treatment) [0045], and Rowan, as combined, teaches passing the filaments through drawing rolls and then finally through a conventional air interlacing jet and then wound up (subjecting the multifilament yarn to an interlacing treatment with an interlacing treatment nozzle that controls tension gradient) (see cols. 2 and 3). Thus, Fujimoto in view of Rowan and Toshio teach cooling before winding, controlling tension before winding, and interlacing between drawing and winding. However, Fujimoto in view of Rowan and Toshio do not appear to expressly teach an interlacing treatment nozzle controls tension gradient.

Palmer teaches that it is well known to operate interlacing jets with air at room temperature (see col. 1, lines 42-50).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to operate the interlacing jets with air at room temperature as taught by Palmer in the interlacing step of Fujimoto in view of Rowan and Toshio because interlacing with air at room temperature is well known (see Palmer, col. 1, ll. 42-50), interlacing air temperature effects the yarn temperature (see Palmer, col. 2, lines 57-64), and cooling PTT before winding beneficially avoids tight winding (controls tension gradient) (see Fujimoto, [0041]).

With respect to the claim limitation of “nozzle,” the interlacing jets taught by Fujimoto, Rowan, and Palmer necessarily include a nozzle because of the acceleration mechanics of a jet.

However, if it is held that a jet does not necessarily include a nozzle for acceleration, Negishi teaches using a fluid jet nozzle within an air jet interlacing apparatus (see col. 8, lines 14-21 and abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use fluid jet nozzle as taught by Negishi in the interlacing apparatus of Fujimoto in order to provide interlaced yarn that contains a desired degree of interlacing for subsequent processing, is free of undesired lengths without interlacing, and requires minimal air jetting for the desired degree of compactness (see Negishi, col. 1, line 63 through col. 2, line 12).

1, 2, 7, and 8) Moreover, in response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., interlacing with a yarn cooling device; forming the yarn into clothing; no second drawing step) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

3) Toshio is relied upon for teach a specific CF value as recited above:

Toshio teaches interlacing to a CF value of 10-100 with a synthetic multifilament fiber (Abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Toshio's CF value with Fujimoto's process of making filaments and intermingling in order to manufacture a sizeless, twistless fabric (see Toshio) and to give a fabric thus obtained excellent softness, stretchability properties, and color developing properties (see Fujimoto [0044]).

4) The claimed heated roll surface roughness is taught by Rowan's teaching of roll surface roughness to be a result-effective variable as described above:

Rowan is directed to a process for high speed, multi-end polyester yarn (Title). Rowan teaches manufacturing a multi-filament yarn by extruding, passing the filaments through drawing rolls, then through relaxing rolls, and then finally through a conventional air interlacing jet and then wound up (columns 2 and 3). The surface finish (R_a) value for the rolls other than the first encountered roll can be between 35 and 120 microinches (0.89 – 3.0 micrometers) (column 4, lines 10 – 20). On page 14 of Applicant's Specification, Applicant indicates that 1.5 S – 8 S is equivalent to 0.8 – 6.3 micrometers as required by claims 15. Rowan suggests that the use of matte rollers produce a yarn with excellent mechanical qualities (column 4, lines 25 – 40).

5) Fujimoto teaches the yarn is relaxed at a ratio of 0.8-0.999, with the ratio being the winding speed/peripheral speed of the second roll (at a relaxation factor of 10-20%) [0040].

6) Fujimoto teaches that the multifilament is wound around a first roll at a speed of 300-3,500 m/min (at a spinning rate of at least 2,000 m/min.) ([0036] and [0037]).

7) The examiner recognizes that all of the claimed effects and physical properties are not positively stated by the reference(s). Note however that the references teach all of the claimed ingredients, process steps, and process conditions and thus, the claimed effects and physical properties would necessarily be achieved by carrying out the disclosed process. If it is applicants' position that this would not be the case: (1) evidence would need to be presented to support applicants' position; and (2) it would be the examiner's position that the application contains inadequate disclosure in that there is no teaching as to how to obtain the claimed properties and effects by carrying out only these steps.

9) Since Toshio is relied upon for being directed to multifilament thermoplastic synthetic fiber (see abstract), it is unclear how successfully manufacturing a sizeless, twistless fabric (see Toshio, abstract) in Fujimoto would not be expected. Toshio does not include Applicant's assumed limitations of excluding PTT. Moreover, motivation to combine Fujimoto and Toshio was presented but not addressed by applicant's arguments.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patrick Butler whose telephone number is (571) 272-8517. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Thu. 7:30 a.m.-5 p.m. and alternating Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christina Johnson can be reached on (571) 272-1176. The fax phone

Art Unit: 1791

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/P. B./

Examiner, Art Unit 1791

/Christina Johnson/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1791